



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/526,778	03/08/2005	James G Moredock	766.42647X00	5854
<div>20457 7590 12/03/2007</div> <div>ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP</div> <div>1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET</div> <div>SUITE 1800</div> <div>ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873</div>				
			EXAMINER	
			HOPKINS, ROBERT A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/526,778

Applicant(s)

MOREDOCK ET AL.

Examiner

Robert A. Hopkins

Art Unit

1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 15-21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3-8-05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Application/Control Number:
10/526,778
Art Unit: 1797

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-14 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 7,056,368.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because many centrifugal separators in the air separation art contain an ejector port, wherein the ejector port is located radially outward of the outermost orbits of a rotating flow, therefore the subject matter of claim 1 of the current application is not patentably distinct from claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,056,368.

Claims 22-24 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 20-22 of U.S. Patent No.

Application/Control Number:
10/526,778
Art Unit: 1797

Page 3

7,056,368. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because many centrifugal separators in the air separation art contain an ejector port, wherein the ejector port is located radially outward of the outermost orbits of a rotating flow, therefore the subject matter of claim 22 of the current application is not patentably distinct from claim 20 of U.S. Patent No. 7,056,368.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15-21 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claim 15 recites "a debris strake connected to the air filter for channeling debris away from the filter to the outermost orbits of the rotating flow". Moredock(6319304) fails to teach a debris strake connected to the the air filter for channeling debris away from the filter to the outermost orbits of the rotating flow. It would not have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a debris strake connected to the air filter for channeling debris away from the filter to the outermost orbits of the rotating flow because Moredock does not suggest such a modification. Claim 16 depends on claim 15 and is also allowed.

Claim 17 recites "channeling debris away from the filter to the outermost orbits of the rotating flow with a debris strake connected to the filter". Moredock(6319304) fails to teach a step of channeling debris away from the filter to the outermost orbits of the rotating flow with a debris strake connected to the filter. It would not have been obvious

Application/Control Number
10/526,778
Art Unit: 1797

Page 4

to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a step of channeling debris away from the filter to the outermost orbits of the rotating flow with a debris strake connected to the filter because Moredock does not suggest such a modification. Claims 18-21 depend on claim 17 and hence are also allowed.

Application/Control Number
10/526,778
Art Unit: 1797


Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert A. Hopkins whose telephone number is 571-272-1159. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30am-5pm, every Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on 571-272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rah
November 26, 2007


ROBERT A. HOPKINS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
A.U. 1797